

3. Remarks:

A. Informalities and §112 Matters.

Certain parts of the application have been objected to and/or rejected for the informalities and/or §112 matters set forth in the Office Action. It is believed that all of those matters have been addressed, as indicated below.

1. Priority.

Applicant's claim of priority has been denied for the reasons stated in the Action. In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the denial because:

a) the international application claiming priority from GB 0208274.1 was filed on April 9, 2003, which is less than twelve months after the April 10, 2002 filing date of the priority application;

b) the international application entered the U.S. National Stage on October 5, 2004, which is before the 30 month deadline for entering the U.S. National Stage; and

c) the claim for priority was timely made.

It is further noted that although the application entered the U.S. National Stage without a signed Declaration, the signed Declaration was timely submitted on August 10, 2005, together with the appropriate fees for submitting the signed Declaration on that date.

2. The abstract.

The abstract has been objected to for not being on a separate sheet of paper and for not being in the range of 50 to 150 words. An amended abstract conforming to those requirements is submitted herewith.

B. Claim Rejections Under §102 and/or §103.

1. The §102(e) rejections based on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0237243 to Dahl.

The Dahl reference is cited under 102(e) as being an application “filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant.” That rejection is traversed because the Dahl reference was not filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant.

The date of “invention by the applicant” is established by the priority filing date, as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §119. That date is April 10, 2002, which is the filing date of the priority application, as noted above.

The Dahl application appears to have an effective U.S. filing date of August 16, 2002 based on the international filing date. It is understood that an application claiming priority from a foreign filing has a U.S. filing date for §102(e) purposes as of its international filing date, and not as of its original foreign priority date.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted the Dahl application was not filed in the United States before the invention by applicant, as required by §102(e). The Dahl reference was filed in the United States on August 16, 2002, while the date of invention by the applicant is at least as early as April 10, 2002. The Dahl reference is therefore not a proper 102(e) reference in this case, and it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Dahl should be withdrawn.

2. The §103 rejection based on Dahl in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,504,392 to Baek.

To the extent the Dahl reference is not 102(e) prior art to the pending application, it is also not combinable with Baek under §103. Accordingly, the pending rejection under §103 based on Dahl combined with Baek should be withdrawn.

To the extent the Office determines that Baek may be cited alone or in combination with other art, applicant submits that the teachings of the prior art still do not teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention. In particular, the teachings of Baek, either alone or in combination with other art of record, does not disclose or suggest a mopping trolley in which the clean receptacle is located under the mop press and the waste receptacle includes a portion positioned below the discharge port of the mop press, whereby liquid expressed from the mop head is conveyed to the waste receptacle.

Considering the Baek reference in more detail, it can be seen that Baek discloses a mopping trolley in which the cleaning liquid is provided in a reservoir that is located behind (although lower than) the mop press assembly. If the Baek device were modified to position the cleaning liquid reservoir under the mop press the Baek device would discharge waste liquid directly into the cleaning liquid reservoir – making the Baek device unsuitable for its intended purpose. Accordingly, the Baek device cannot be modified to provide the claimed invention, and the rejection under §103 should be withdrawn.

C. Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 19-20 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections set forth in this Office Action and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 19 has been amended to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and claim 20 continues to depend from claim 19.

D. Conclusion.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the pending application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Timothy N. Thomas
Timothy N. Thomas, Reg. No. 35714
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456